DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 754 HE 032 304

AUTHOR Brown, J. David; VanWagoner, Randall J.
TITLE Organizational Climate: The Overlooked Dimension of Institutional Effectiveness. AIR 1999 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE 1999-06-00
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (39th, Seattle, WA, May 30-June 3, 1999).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty College Relationship; Focus Groups; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Effectiveness; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on an ongoing organizational climate assessment used as one of 10 indicators of institutional effectiveness at a midsize suburban community college. Organizational climate is thought to allow more precise specifications than the overall organizational culture and facilitates, a more comprehensive comparison of change in both climate and effectiveness. The study employed both quantitative and qualitative research methods with data sources including an "Institutional Climate Survey" distributed to all full-time employees (N=215) and four focus group discussions. Survey results are interpreted for: respondents' views of the planning process at both the general college and department/work unit levels, training and professional development, job satisfaction, and institutional integrity (or "person-to-organization" relationships). Analysis of focus group discussions identified faculty dissatisfaction with the administration as the most emotionally charged issue. The focus groups have led to a series of open forum meetings of faculty and staff to engage in ongoing dialogue. (Contains 27 references.) (DB)

Organizational Climate: The Overlooked Dimension of Institutional Effectiveness*

J. David Brown
Randall J. VanWagoner
Red Rocks Community College
13300 West 6th Avenue
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1255
303-914-6378

* Paper presented at the 39th Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Researchers, May 30-June 2, 1999, Seattle, Washington. An earlier version of this work has been submitted to Research in Higher Education for possible publication.

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Ninth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held in Seattle, Washington, May 30-June 3, 1999.
This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of AIR Forum Papers.

Dolores Vura
Editor
Air Forum Publications

Organizational Climate:
The Overlooked Dimension of Institutional Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The assessment of institutional effectiveness has remained incomplete due to the absence of organizational climate measures. Organizational climate is a seminal indicator of institutional effectiveness that it is geared towards specifying the interrelationship between organizational initiatives as well as the behaviors, perceptions, and verbalizations of its members. Employing a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods, this article demonstrates how a midsize suburban community college has incorporated an ongoing organizational climate assessment as one of its ten indicators of institutional effectiveness. The applicable utility of assessing organizational climate, as opposed to organizational culture, are compared. We contend that organizational climate avails itself to more precise specifications of the overall culture and facilitates a more comprehensive comparison of changes in both climate and effectiveness. Institutional integrity must be understood as a major dimension of organizational climate in that organizational members both observe and attribute motives to specific organizational behaviors in the same manner that motives are attributed to individual behaviors. The inclusion of organizational climate into the assessment of institutional effectiveness provides a previously overlooked level of insight that can be employed to more comprehensively inform the creation and implementation of organizational initiatives.

INTRODUCTION

Although the fire of community discontent with higher education was sparked by the landmark publication A Nation At Risk (1983), it has since been re-fueled by increased demands for services, competitive educational markets, rising tuition, declining resources, and waning confidence in the value of college degrees. As a result of these growing concerns, institutions of higher education have increasingly been challenged by federal and state legislators, academic accrediting agencies, business leaders, and community members to assess and demonstrate the effectiveness of their respective organizations.

In response to this intensifying challenge for accountability (Alfred 1997), there has been a staggering proliferation of institutional effectiveness models, as well as organizational culture and climate theories, concepts, models, and definitions. Whereas, institutional effectiveness energies have been geared towards articulating and operationalizing the linkage between institutional purpose and performance (Ewell, 1992), organizational culture/climate studies have been guided by the assumption that a more comprehensive understanding of these domains inevitably lead to increased institutional effectiveness (Tierney, 1990).

Despite the fact that vital linkages exist between organizational culture/climate and institutional effectiveness, only a sparse amount of research has been devoted to explicating their interrelationship (e.g., Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Moran & Volkwein, 1988; Schein, 1985; Smart & Hamm, 1993). Instead, organizational culture/climate and institutional effectiveness studies have traversed separate paths. It is not surprising, therefore, that within the midst of this tremendous amount of "differentiation without

integration" there exists a "less than coherent picture" (Roueche et al., 1997) regarding the extent of community colleges' adoption of effectiveness measures and practices.

According to Alfred (1997:10), there has been "...little documented thinking about the nature and scope of a comprehensive effectiveness model—one that integrates internally—and externally focused indicators." Drawing from Alfred's lead, we contend that a comprehensive effectiveness model must give consideration to and include some measure of organizational climate. In this paper we demonstrate how a midsize, suburban comprehensive community college has responded to that challenge by incorporating an ongoing organizational climate assessment as one of its ten indicators of institutional effectiveness.

We begin this work by more fully examining the linkages that exist between organizational culture and climate. Next, we specify the relationship between the study of organizational climate and institutional effectiveness. Third, we discuss the methods employed for the collection of our quantitative and qualitative data. Fourth, we interpret our findings. Finally, we examine the policy implications of this research as well as offer suggestions for future research.

Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate

Organizations are a microcosm of the larger society in which they are situated in that they too possess a culture, a structure, patterns of interaction, and people. As a "sense maker," an organization's culture profoundly influences members' understandings of organizational life by providing them "webs of meaning" (Geertz, 1973) to evaluate their experiences. According to Peterson and Spencer (1990:6) an organizational culture is

composed of "...deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization or its work." An organization's culture similarly shapes members' behaviors by providing them with a repertoire of habits, skills, and styles from which to construct "strategies of action" (Swidler, 1986).

Despite the fact that significant gains have been made towards theoretically articulating the abstract dimensions that exist within an organization's culture (Schein 1985, Peterson & Spencer 1990), specifying their direct policy implications, role in patterning interaction, and affect upon organizational members is highly problematic for four reasons. First, theories of organizational culture tend to be overly macro in their orientation. Their accounts are neglectful of the on-going dialect that exists between an organization's culture and its members. In the midst of rapid social and organizational change, members are constantly in the process of creating/deconstructing and affirming/resisting the culture that shapes their understandings. Since members are not born or exist solely within their respective organization, they import a multitude of meanings from other "more or less significant" spheres of social life. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that all members equally ascribe to these "...deeply shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies..."The notion of an homogenous organization culture that is "deeply embedded, enduring, and not malleable" (Clark, 1970) is illusory. Rather, it is fraught with contradictory values, conflicting strategies of action, and competing occupational interests. Second, theories of organizational culture fail to account for the role of extra-organizational influences in shaping culture. An organization's culture does

not exist in a social vacuum. Instead, it is coupled to more powerful and competing organizational subcultures, as well as society's overarching culture, that can invoke change regardless of the respective organization's deeply shared values and/or beliefs (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). An organization's culture thusly represents a composite of meanings that can only speciously be assumed to be the unique property of that organization. Thirdly, due to the pervasive and all-encompassing nature of culture, it is methodologically questionable to presuppose that anyone can culturally immunize themselves from the influences they seek to understand. There are no privileged observational vantage-points beyond the influences of that culture. Since all activities occurring within an organization are literally part of its culture, the research act itself (e.g., a study of its culture, its climate, its effectiveness) is a cultural artifact. Finally, cultural studies are extremely time consuming, methodologically problematic and paradoxical (i.e., a priori specification of cultural content is impossible but identification of content is critical to understanding culture), yield information that is "essentially incomplete" (cf. Peterson and Spencer, 1990), and can only be understood within the context of the specific organization (Ouchi and Wilkins, 1988).

Though theories of organizational culture have certainly provided a useful knowledge cumulation function, theoretical ideas matter little in the daily lives of organizational members (Garfinkel, 1967). For the overwhelming majority of them, the notion of organizational culture is, at best, a "folk concept" (Turner, 1957) or an "element of practical consciousness" (Giddens, 1984) referring to a set of vague and diffuse but vitally felt organizational expectations and obligations that exist in the form of job

responsibilities and patterns of interaction. It is for these reasons that the study of organizational climate affords a much greater opportunity to develop a more comprehensive understanding of organizational members' beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors as they pertain to organizational structure, policies and practices, and patterns of interaction. An organization climate study thus suspends the theoretical burden of articulating the intricately complex web of dialectical relations between an organization, its members, other organizations, and the overarching culture.

Due to its concern with current perceptions and attitudes of various organizational phenomena rather than deeply held meanings, beliefs, and values, the information gleaned from a climate study is much more pragmatic for two distinct reasons. First, to the degree that an organization's culture is anything more than an "analytical distinction," it can only be actualized in the observable behaviors, artifacts, and verbalizations of its members. Since the seminal focus of a climate study is geared towards tapping these dimensions, we liken it to conducting an "organizational biopsy" of members' perceptions of organizational life as they pertain to more clearly specified elements of the overall culture (e.g., institutional goals and functioning, governance and decision-making, teaching and learning processes, training and technology, workplace dynamics). Second, since these elements can be specified and more precisely measured, it is possible to ascertain the effects of particular organizational initiatives as well as compare changes and perceptions of these changes over time and across organizational subgroups.

Institutional Effectiveness and Organizational Climate

The development and assessment of defined institutional effectiveness indicators represents one of the most significant organizational initiatives in higher education (Nunley and Breneman, 1988; Brint and Karabel, 1989; McGrath and Spear, 1991). This initiative is particularly problematic for community colleges since they are the single largest sector of American higher education with over 1,200 organizations serving more than five million students (AACC, 1999).

Institutional Effectiveness Indicators

A. Students	
	1. Students Learn.
	2. Students Continue Their Studies to Achieve Their Goals
	3. Students Are Satisfied With Their Experiences
	4. Students Achieve Their Goals of Degree Completion
	5. Meets the Employment Needs of Students
	6. Students Experience Transfer Success
	7. Maintains an Appropriate Share of its Market
	8. Provides Students Access to Education
B. Faculty and Staff	
	9. We Develop and Maintain a Healthy Organizational Climate
C. Community	
	10. We Meet the Needs of Our External Communities

TABLE 1

In light of our previous discussion regarding the practical utility of the climate study, it follows as a fundamental component of our institutional effectiveness model. Our effectiveness model is a constituency-based model that has identified indicators vis-à-vis it's interactions with the organizational constituents it serves. Within this model, institutional effectiveness represents a multidimensional process involving planning, on-going evaluation, and appropriate modifications that are designed to ensure that our

performance is aligned with our mission (Hudgins and Mahaffey, 1997). Institutional effectiveness in our model is measured by ten indicators:

The inclusion of an organizational climate indicator into an effectiveness model reflects our conviction that ***the extent to which an organization maintains a healthy climate is the extent to which an organization can be effective***. This is consistent with Cameron's (1986) findings that the most powerful factors associated with effectiveness in colleges and universities tend to be internal factors. Our climate indicator (i.e., effectiveness indicator 9) consists of four scales: General College and Department; Training and Professional Development; Job Satisfaction; and Institutional Integrity. Drawing from Peterson and Spencer's (1990:13) discussion of climate dimensions, these scales measure faculty and staff's views concerning, (1) "...various institutional patterns and behaviors, institutional goals and functioning, governance and decision making..." and, (2) how these members feel about their work in regards to "loyalty and commitment, morale and satisfaction, quality of effort and involvement, and sense of belonging."

METHODS

Data sources were triangulated in this study to overcome weaknesses inherent within single data collection schemes and to build interpretations of group members' perceptions of the organizational climate. Our primary data source consisted of a forty-four (44) item, self-administered, "Institutional Climate Survey" (ICS) distributed to all full-time employees (n=215) during the spring, 1997, semester. 1

In order to ensure representativeness and a high response rate, members of the

1 . A more comprehensive and inclusive discussion of our research methodology and description of

Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) were responsible for distributing and collecting surveys, providing clarification, and confirming confidentiality to all survey respondents. The qualitative data used in this study were collected at four (4) focus group discussions conducted during the fall, 1997, semester. Members of the IEC acted in the capacity of focus group interviewers and note-takers for this phase of the data collection process.

CLIMATE SURVEY FINDINGS

The climate of an organization is, by definition, a phenomenon subject to change for many reasons. The multitude of organizational initiatives emanating from increased demands for demonstrations of accountability and effectiveness, in our opinion, represent the most critical "reasons" for the changing climactic conditions of community colleges. Characteristic of other community colleges responding to those demands, we have instituted numerous initiatives designed to enhance its status and effectiveness as a competitive learning organization. In light of those initiatives, the following ICS and focus group findings afford us the opportunity to evaluate their impact on the quality of organizational life at the college.

General College and Department

This scale concerned itself with respondents' views on the impact of initiatives emerging from the planning process at both the general college and the department/work unit levels. The General College and Department scale consisted of the first 17 statements on the ICS and received an overall scale score of 3.98 (reliability=.93). As a collective,

---

the Institutional Climate Survey is available by contacting the authors.

respondents were in agreement with the items subsumed within this scale. They agreed the college is fulfilling its mission (3.96) and that the college is a valued member of the community (4.39). At the department/work unit level, they agreed that innovation is supported at the college (4.55), assessment is effective (4.01), goals are critical to work quality (4.25), rational decision making is employed (4.28), individual goals are aligned with the college's strategic plan (4.26), and they participate in the department/work unit planning process (4.58).

General College and Department

DESCRIPTION	Q#	Overall	Admin.	Classified	Faculty	Tech/Pro	ANOVA
Strategic plan provides direction	1	3.76	4.24	3.98	3.43	3.79	0.07
Strategic plan is consistent with mission	2	3.85	4.47	3.87	3.59	4.07	
Strategic plan has been clearly presented	3	3.36	4.22	3.60	2.90	3.29	0.02
I understand the strategic plan	4	3.29	3.89	3.50	2.85	3.57	0.04
The college is a valued partner in the community	5	4.39	4.33	4.48	4.31	4.36	0.001
I participate in developing unit plans	6	4.58	5.11	3.68	5.17	4.93	0.007
Innovation is encourage in my dept./work unit	7	4.55	5.17	4.08	4.80	4.73	
My dept./work unit goals are critical to success	8	4.25	4.61	4.34	3.96	4.33	
My dept./work unit regularly assesses effectiveness	9	4.01	4.44	4.00	3.76	4.40	
My dept./work unit works toward common goals	10	4.44	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.53	
My dept./work unit assesses support of learning	11	4.02	4.46	4.00	3.78	4.38	
Decisions in my dept./work unit are rational	12	4.28	4.83	3.97	4.46	4.00	
My individual goals are related to the strategic plan	13	4.26	4.88	4.09	4.17	4.46	
Teamwork is used effectively	14	3.43	4.18	3.54	3.07	3.20	0.02
Innovation is supported at the college	15	3.68	4.22	3.82	3.31	3.53	0.07
Systems are aligned to support learning	16	3.52	4.00	3.98	2.79	3.71	0.001
The college is fulfilling its mission	17	3.96	4.56	4.11	3.56	4.21	0.02
SCALE AVERAGE		3.98	4.51	3.96	3.78	4.09	
SCALE RELIABILITY=.93							

TABLE 2

Despite the overall level of agreement associated with this scale, there are three areas where agreement is marginal. The first area concerns the college's strategic plan and suggests that although it provides direction (3.76) and is consistent with our mission (3.85), it has not been clearly presented (3.36) nor do respondents understand it (3.29). Whereas administration provided the highest rating on strategic planning items (i.e., Q#1-4), faculty

rated these same items the lowest. Second, respondents did not agree that teamwork was used effectively at the college (3.43). Though administration expressed a belief in the effective use of teamwork (4.18), no other employee group shared this sentiment. Finally, respondents' attitudes toward institutional systems being aligned to support teaching and learning are virtually ambivalent (3.52).

Training and Professional Development

The fundamental purpose of instituting an institutional effectiveness process is to improve teaching and learning (Hudgins and Williams, 1997). Everyone associated with the college is considered a learner and a stakeholder in this venture. It is vital, therefore, that opportunities for skills enhancement be afforded to all staff members. Furthermore, all staff must come to the realization that the acquisition of further skills is both a necessary and an on-going process. The Training and Professional Development scale was designed to obtain respondents' views regarding the ways in which the college has responded to these issues. This scale was composed of statements 18-25 and received an overall scale score of 4.13 (reliabilities=.81).

Training and Professional Development

DESCRIPTION	Q#	Overall	Admin.	Classified	Faculty	Tech/Pro	ANOVA
Professional development is supported	18	3.89	4.28	4.05	3.60	3.87	
Training opportunities have been helpful	19	3.95	4.00	4.09	3.75	4.07	
Adequate time is provided for my development	20	2.87	3.78	3.18	2.19	2.80	0.001
I have opportunities to update my skills	21	3.81	4.50	3.81	3.59	3.73	
I know in what skill areas I am doing well	22	4.69	4.28	4.68	4.93	4.43	
I know in what skill areas I need to improve	23	4.76	4.50	4.76	4.85	4.79	
Technological tools are important to do my job	24	4.99	5.44	5.13	4.65	5.07	0.04
I have the technological tools to do my job	25	4.09	4.56	4.18	3.85	4.07	
SCALE AVERAGE		4.13	4.42	4.24	3.93	4.10	
SCALE RELIABILITY=.81							

TABLE 3

As Table 3 indicates, agreement is strong across all items represented in this scale with the exception of having adequate time to update their skills. All respondents were in agreement that the college supports their professional development (3.89), they are provided opportunities for updating their skills and abilities (3.81), and the training they have received is helpful (3.95). Similarly, all respondents agreed they know both the performance areas in which they are doing well (4.69) and the additional skills they need to improve their job performance (4.76). Finally, respondents agreed that technological tools were important for effective job performance (4.99) and that these tools have been provided to them (4.09).

The remarkable exception to the trend of agreement exhibited throughout this scale is the disagreement expressed by classified (3.18), faculty (2.19), and technical/professional (2.80) staff concerning adequate time to update their skills (2.87). "Added administrative and departmental workload responsibilities" was the primary reason offered by faculty for their disagreement with this item. Classified and technical/professional staff, by contrast, cited "scheduling conflicts" as the basis for their disagreement.

Job Satisfaction

Faculty and staff are primary internal stakeholders who participate in the planning and implementation of programs and services delivering "value" to students and the community. Maintaining a high quality relationship between the college and its faculty/staff is imperative for actualizing the college's mission. The Job Satisfaction scale

was designed to capture faculty and staff's perceptions of the "meaningfulness" of this relationship as related primarily to the "intrinsic satisfactions" associated with their job (e.g., meaningfulness of work, interesting, challenging, enjoyment). Represented by items 26-35, Job Satisfaction received an overall scale score of 4.65 (reliabilities=.84).

Job Satisfaction

DESCRIPTION	Q#	Overall	Admin.	Classified	Faculty	Tech/Pro	ANOVA
My work is meaningful	26	5.26	5.33	5.07	5.48	5.07	
Dissenting opinions are considered	27	3.24	4.18	3.37	2.71	3.47	0.003
I am encourage to be creative in my job	28	4.41	5.18	4.42	4.07	4.73	0.03
I like my job	29	5.13	5.00	5.08	5.15	5.33	
My work is challenging	30	5.26	5.35	5.03	5.46	5.33	
I am able to use my skills effectively at work	31	4.79	4.76	4.72	4.70	5.27	
My work is interesting	32	5.25	5.35	4.98	5.39	5.67	
I am trusted to do my job	33	5.02	5.35	5.19	4.57	5.47	0.01
My supervisor lets me know expectations	34	4.59	4.76	4.53	4.52	4.80	
My service on committees results in positive change	35	3.57	3.63	3.61	3.33	4.36	
SCALE AVERAGE		4.65	4.89	4.60	4.54	4.95	
SCALE RELIABILITY=.84							

TABLE 4

The Job Satisfaction scale received the highest overall scores. All respondents felt that their work is meaningful (5.26), their jobs are challenging (5.26) and interesting (5.25), and they feel trusted to do their jobs (5.02). There was overall agreement that supervisors let them know what was expected in the performance of their job responsibilities (4.59), creativity is encouraged (4.41), and they are able to use their skills effectively (4.79). The belief that positive changes emanate from committee work, however, is marginal (3.57). Faculty voiced their low rating of this item (3.33) in terms of "added administrative workload responsibilities." They also suggested that a lot of committee work was unnecessary. As one faculty member put it, "It's like we create problems so we can get a committee together to solve it."

The item that received the lowest overall score concerned itself with the role of

dissenting opinions in the decision-making processes at the college (3.24). Though administrators agreed that dissenting opinions are considered in the decision making process (4.18), this perception was not shared by faculty (2.71), classified (3.37), or technical/professional (3.47) staff. Faculty perceptions of this issue centered around their mistrust of recent administrative policies, rapid organizational change, and the President's Leadership Team (PLT). The classified staff's perceptions, by contrast, were more localized and related to problems they were having with a specific supervisor.

Institutional Integrity

Individuals are the primary actors in the drama of organizational life. Informed by job descriptions, workload responsibilities, mission statements, and professional expectations, they carry out their duties within an organizational environment that is imbued with a reality greater than the sum of its individual parts. Organizations, according to Wheatley (1992:13), "...are conscious entities, possessing many of the properties of living systems." In that regard, an organization is an entity possessing both a "life of its own" and the capacity to "act" on its own behalf. This means that the relationships that exist within an organization are not exclusively person-to-person. Rather, they are also "person-to-organization." It is possible, therefore, for individuals to both observe and attribute motives to specific organizational behaviors much in the same manner that motives are attributed to individual behaviors.

The Institutional Integrity scale was created to assess faculty and staff's quality of "person-to-organization" relationships. As the term "integrity" implies, our concern was to measure their perceptions of the organization's "moral compass" (e.g., fairness, trust,

equality, pride, respect) regarding the behavior of the college, in general. The Institutional Integrity scale was composed of statements 47-55 and received an overall scale score of 4.13 (reliabilities=.91).

Institutional Integrity

DESCRIPTION	Q#	Overall	Admin.	Classified	Faculty	Tech/Pro	ANOVA
I feel I am fairly treated by the college	47	4.31	5.11	4.43	3.85	4.5	0.006
I have not been discriminated against here	48	4.74	5.33	4.86	4.21	5.36	0.01
The administration models college values	49	3.70	4.33	4.00	3.13	3.47	0.01
The college hires based on skills and abilities	50	3.96	4.44	3.78	3.98	4.00	
The college promotes based on skills and abilities	51	3.41	4.06	3.13	3.48	3.54	
I take pride in being associated with the college	52	5.00	5.56	4.98	4.78	5.13	
Employees demonstrate personal integrity	53	4.31	4.44	4.41	4.22	4.07	
I trust the President's Leadership Team	54	3.58	4.61	3.82	2.84	3.93	0.001
Diversity is respected at the college	55	4.12	4.82	4.22	3.67	4.57	0.01
SCALE AVERAGE		4.13	4.74	4.18	3.80	4.29	
SCALE RELIABILITY=.91							

TABLE 5

Overall, faculty and staff take pride in their association with the college (5.00) and believe that their colleagues demonstrate integrity (4.31). Paradoxically, while respondents feel that the college hires individuals on the basis of their skills/abilities (3.96), they do not agree that it promotes by these same criteria (3.41). Classified staff attributed their low rating of this item (3.13) to "office politics" and "supervisor favoritism." Nevertheless, there was overall agreement to the statements that faculty and staff do not feel that they are discriminated against (4.74) and that diversity is respected at the college (4.12). Finally, there were low levels of agreement to the statements that college administrators model the values of the college (3.70) and their trust of the President's Leadership Team (3.58).

Focus group discussion concerning the low scoring of "administration modeling the values of the college" (3.13) and "trust of the President's Leadership Team" (2.84) proved

to be faculty's most outspoken and emotionally charged issues. Consistent with Kempner's (1990) findings that administration represented the "common enemy" uniting community college faculty, the President's Leadership Team (PLT) is the primary source of mistrust and suspicion for the faculty. Subsequent discussions revealed, however, that the word "Leadership" in the new President's Leadership Team created a symbolic blinking word for faculty. As one faculty said, "If it were named The President's Executive Council, I wouldn't have a problem with it exclusively being made up of administrators. To call it a leadership team and then exclude faculty... I mean, this insinuates that we are not leaders. "

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have argued that any assessment of institutional effectiveness will remain incomplete in the absence of measuring the organizational climate. To that end, we have compared the applicable utility of assessing organizational climate as opposed to organizational culture. It has been our contention that organizational climate is a seminal indicator of institutional effectiveness in that it is geared towards specifying the interrelationship between specific organizational initiatives and the behaviors, perceptions, and verbalizations of its members. Furthermore, since it avails itself to more precise specifications of the overall culture (e.g., institutional goals and functioning, governance and decision-making, teaching and learning process) it facilitates a more comprehensive comparison of changes in both climate and effectiveness.

The inclusion of organizational climate moves institutional effectiveness from an often externally driven mandate to an internally driven conversation within the college. In

that regard, we discovered that our focus group sessions had more far reaching ramifications than just providing context and perspective for the quantitative ICS data. Rather, they provided the substantive catalyst for developing and pursuing an internally driven conversation within our college. The constituent focus group sessions sparked a series of open forum meetings called "Common Ground" for faculty and staff to engage in an ongoing dialogue about the college's past, present, and most importantly its future.

We have also argued that institutional integrity must be understood as a major dimension of organizational climate. This claim is based on the fact that organizational members both observe and attribute motives to specific organizational behaviors in the same manner that motives are attributed to individual behaviors. Finally, it has been our contention that the inclusion of organizational climate into the assessment of institutional effectiveness provides a previously overlooked level of insight that can be employed to more comprehensively inform the creation and implementation of organizational initiatives.

REFERENCES

AACC (American Association of Community Colleges), 1999. All About Community Colleges. http://www.www.aacc.nche.edu.

Alfred, R. (1997). From Closed to Open Systems: New Designs for Effectiveness in Community Colleges. Journal of Applied Research in the Community College (vol. 5, no. 1) Spring (pp. 9-19).

Brint, S. and Karabel, J. (1989). The Diverted Dream. New York: Oxford.

Cameron, K.S. (1986). A Study of Organizational Effectiveness and its Predictors. Management Science (32). pp. 87-112.

Cameron, K.S. and Ettington, D.R. (1988). The Conceptual Foundations of Organizational Culture. In J.C. Smart (ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (vol. 4, pp. 356-396). New York: Agathon.

Clark, B.R. (1970). The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine.

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. American Sociological Review, 48: pp. 147-160.

Ewell, P.T. (1992). Outcomes Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation. Resource Papers for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 343 513).

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Geertz, C. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. New York: Basic.

Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society. Berkeley: University of California.

Hudgins, J.L. and Mahaffey, J. (1997). When Institutional Effectiveness and Performance Funding Co-Exist. Journal of Applied Research in the Community College (vol. 5, no. 1) Spring (pp. 21-28).

Hudgins, J.L. and Williams, S.K. (1997). Seizing the Opportunity of Institutional Effectiveness. Pp. 53-67 in Roueche, J.E. and Johnson, L. F., Roueche, S.D. and Associates (eds.) Embracing the Tiger. Washington D.C.: Community College Press.

Kempner, K. (1990). Faculty Culture in the Community College: Facilitating or Hindering Learning. The Review of Higher Education (vol. 13, no. 2) Winter (pp. 215-235).

McGrath, D. and Spear, M.B. (1991). The Academic Crisis of the Community College. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Moran, E.T. and Volkwein, J.F. (1988). Examining Organizational Climate In Institutions of Higher Education. Research in Higher Education (vol. 28, no. 4) pp. 367-383.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Nunley, C.R. and Breneman, D.W. (1988). Defining and Measuring Quality in Community Colleges. Pp. 62-92 in J.S. Eaton (ed.) Colleges of Choice. New York: Macmillan.

Ouchi, W.G. and Wilkins, A.G. (1988). Organizational Culture. In Westoby, A. (ed.) Culture and Power in Educational Organizations. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Peterson, M. and Spencer, M. (1990). Understanding Academic Culture and Climate. Assessing Academic Cultures and Climates: New Directions for Institutional Research. (No. 68, Winter: pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roueche, J.E. and Johnson, L. F., Roueche, S.D. and Associates (1997). Embracing the Tiger. Washington D.C.: Community College Press.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smart, J.C. and Hamm, R.E. (1993). Organizational Culture and Effectiveness in Two Year Colleges. Research in Higher Education (vol. 34, No. 1) pp. 95-106.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. American Sociological Review (Vol. 51: April) pp. 273-286.

Tierney, W. [ed.] (1990). Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures. (No. 68, Winter 1990). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Turner, R. (1957). The Normative Coherence of Folk Concepts. Research Studies of the State College of Washington 25: pp. 127-136.

Wheatley, M. (1992). Leadership and the New Science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").